

## REMARKS

Claims 1 – 30 are in the application. Claims 1, 5, 11, and 21 currently amended and claims 2 – 4, 6 – 10, 12 – 20, and 22 – 30 remain unchanged from the original versions thereof. Claims 1, 11, and 21 are the independent claims herein.

No new matter has been added to the application as a result of the amendments submitted herewith. For example, the amendments to claims 1, 5, 11, and 21 are provided to clarify that which is claimed by Applicant and are supported by the Specification, paragraphs [0028] – [0037] (including the illustrative example described in detail at paragraphs [0031] – [0037]) and FIGS. 5 and 6.

Reconsideration and further examination are respectfully requested.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112**

Claims 1 – 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. This claim rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that claims 1, 11, and 21 are amended to recite, in part,

appending the selected character in the instance the selected character is not included in a set of misrecognized characters and appending one or more characters selected from the set of misrecognized characters including the selected character to each potential character string match in a prior potential match set constructed for a preceding selected character, to obtain a current set of potential character string matches, wherein the prior potential match set exists but is empty for the first selected character; and

deleting from the current set of potential character string matches potential character string matches missing from a list of reference character strings (emphasis added) (See claim 1)

Thus, it is seen that Applicant claims:

(1) the prior potential match set exists but is empty for the first selected character;

(2) in the instance the selected character is not included in the set of misrecognized characters, the selected character is appended to the prior potential match set; and

(3) one or more characters selected from the set of misrecognized characters including the selected character is appended to each potential character string match in the prior potential match set.

Accordingly, there does exist a “prior potential match set” for the first selected character to be appended to (it exists but is empty, as claimed). Applicant submits that the Specification supports this aspect of the claims based on the example discussed at paragraph [0032] involving the first spoken letter “T”. As illustrated in Table 1, the set of misrecognized characters including the character “T” (e.g., B, C, D, E, G, P, T, V, Z) is appended to the empty prior potential match set (i.e., the Previous Character String Matches clearly labeled “NONE”) to obtain a current set of potential character string matches (e.g., B, C, D, E, G, P, T, V, Z). Those potential character string matches (e.g., B, G, P, Z) missing from the list of reference strings (i.e., C, D, E, M, T) are deleted from the current set of potential character string matches to yield C, D, E, T.

Applicant therefore requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims under 35 USC 112, second paragraph since the issue raised by the Office Action has been adequately addressed and resolved by the current claim amendments.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 101**

Claims 21 – 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 101 because the claimed invention was alleged to be directed to non-statutory subject matter. This rejection is traversed.

While not agreeing with the reasons for the rejection under 35 USC 101, Applicant has amended the system of claim 21 to include (1) a voice platform including a telephony interface and a speech recognition system and (2) voice browser implemented on a computer, as disclosed, for example, in FIG. 1 and discussed at

paragraph [0018]. Applicant notes that paragraph [0018] states that in one exemplary implementation, the voice platform and browser are implemented on a general purpose computer system (See paragraph [0018], last sentence) Applicant therefore submits that the claimed system is not, at least as now claimed, non-statutory subject matter.

Applicant therefore requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of claims 21 – 30 under 35 USC 101.

### **Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 102**

Claims 1 – 30 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Marx et al. (“Reliable Spelling Despite Poor Spoken Letter Recognition”, Proc. Of the American Voice I/O Society, San Jose, CA, September 20-22, 1994). This rejection is traversed.

Applicant notes that the Office Action did not consider the “appending” and “deleting” aspects of the claims based on the rejection under 35 USC 112, second paragraph. Accordingly, the Office Action is silent regarding these claimed aspects. Applicant submits however that the aspects of constructing a current potential match set of potential character string matches, including the recited appending and deleting aspects are not disclosed by the cited and relied upon Marx.

Applicant notes that Marx does not disclose or suggest the claimed aspects of, appending the selected character in the instance the selected character is not included in a set of misrecognized characters or appending one or more characters selected from the set of misrecognized characters including the selected character to each potential character string match in a prior potential match set constructed for a preceding selected character, to obtain a current set of potential character string matches, wherein the prior potential match set exists but is empty for the first selected character; and deleting from the current set of potential character string matches potential character string matches missing from a list of reference character strings. In

particular, Marx does not disclose the specific “appending” and “deleting” operations and the specific associated conditions recited in claims 1, 11, and 21. Marx, in general terms, discloses comparing letters as they are received with a list of names and eliminating names from the list and additional letters are received. However, no disclosure is made of the particular “appending” and “deleting” recited in the subject claims.

Applicant therefore requests the reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejection of the claims 1 – 30 under 35 USC 102(b), and the allowance of same.

### CONCLUSION

Accordingly, Applicants respectfully request allowance of the pending claims. If any issues remain, or if the Examiner has any further suggestions for expediting allowance of the present application, the Examiner is kindly invited to contact the undersigned.

SIEMENS CORPORATION  
**Customer Number: 28524**  
Intellectual Property Department  
170 Wood Avenue South  
Iselin, New Jersey 08830

Attn: Elsa Keller, Legal Department  
Telephone: 732-321-3026

Respectfully submitted,

---

Michele L. Conover  
Registration No. 34,962  
Attorney for Applicants